REPORT OF THE AUDIT OF THE MUHLENBERG COUNTY FISCAL COURT

For The Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014



ADAM H. EDELEN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS www.auditor.ky.gov

209 ST. CLAIR STREET FRANKFORT, KY 40601-1817 TELEPHONE (502) 564-5841 FACSIMILE (502) 564-2912

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AUDIT EXAMINATION OF THE MUHLENBERG COUNTY FISCAL COURT

June 30, 2014

The Auditor of Public Accounts has completed the audit of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court for fiscal year ended June 30, 2014.

We have issued an unmodified opinion, based on our audit, on the Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Fund Balances - Regulatory Basis of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky. In accordance with OMB Circular A-133, we have issued an unmodified opinion on the compliance requirements that are applicable to Muhlenberg County's major federal programs: CFDA #14.228 and CFDA #16.738. Also, in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, we have issued a modified opinion on the compliance requirements that are applicable to Muhlenberg County's major federal program: CFDA #11.300.

Financial Condition:

The Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court had total receipts of \$18,376,326 and disbursements of \$20,050,415 in fiscal year 2014. This resulted in a total ending fund balance of \$4,404,721, which is a decrease of \$889,887 from the prior year.

Report Comments:

2014-001	The Fiscal Court Does Not Have Adequate Controls Over Decentralized Receipts							
2014-002	Telephone Commissions Contracts Should Be Approved By Fiscal Court And All Jail							
	Disbursements Should Be Budgeted							
2014-003	Internal Controls Over Disbursements/Credit Cards Should Be Strengthened							
2014-004	The Fiscal Court Should Advertise For And Award Bids In Accordance With KRS 424.260							
2014-005	The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Activities Allowed Or							
	Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, And Cash Management And Received Duplicate							
	Reimbursements For The Same Costs							
2014-006	The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting							
	And Submitted A Materially Misstated Financial Report To The United States Department Of							
	Commerce-Economic Development Administration							
2014-007	The Fiscal Court Should Document Approval/Presentation Of All Expenditures Prior To Payment							
2014-008	The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting							
	For The Edward Byrne Grant And Had Questioned Costs Of \$12,832							

Deposits:

The fiscal court's deposits as of June 30, 2014, were exposed to custodial credit risk as follows:

• Uncollateralized and Uninsured \$213,894

The fiscal court's deposits were covered by FDIC insurance and a properly executed collateral security agreement, but the bank did not adequately collateralize the fiscal court's deposits in accordance with the security agreement.

<u>CONTENTS</u>	PAGE
NDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT	1
MUHLENBERG COUNTY OFFICIALS	4
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES - REGULATORY BASIS	6
NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT	10
BUDGETARY COMPARISON SCHEDULES	23
NOTES TO REGULATORY SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION - BUDGETARY COMPARISON SCHEDULES	30
SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS	33
NOTES TO REGULATORY SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION - SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS	34
SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS	37
NOTES TO THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS	38
Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standar	RDS41
REPORT ON COMPLIANCE FOR EACH MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM AND REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE	
N ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133	45
SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS	51
APPENDIX A:	
CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE - LOCAL GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AND	DEVELOPMENT

PROGRAMS



ADAM H. EDELEN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

To the People of Kentucky
Honorable Steven L. Beshear, Governor
Lori H. Flanery, Secretary
Finance and Administration Cabinet
Honorable Rick Newman, Muhlenberg County Judge/Executive
Members of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court

Independent Auditor's Report

Report on the Financial Statement

We have audited the accompanying Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Fund Balances - Regulatory Basis of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky, for the year ended June 30, 2014, and the related notes to the financial statement.

Management's Responsibility for the Financial Statement

Management is responsible for the preparation and fair presentation of this financial statement in accordance with accounting practices prescribed or permitted by the Department for Local Government to demonstrate compliance with the Commonwealth of Kentucky's regulatory basis of accounting and budget laws. Management is also responsible for the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of a financial statement that is free from material misstatement, whether due to fraud or error.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on this financial statement based on our audit. We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America, the standards applicable to financial audits contained in <u>Government Auditing Standards</u>, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States and the <u>Audit Guide for Fiscal Court Audits</u> issued by the Auditor of Public Accounts, Commonwealth of Kentucky. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statement is free from material misstatement.

An audit involves performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statement. The procedures selected depend on the auditor's judgment, including the assessment of the risks of material misstatement of the financial statement, whether due to fraud or error. In making those risk assessments, the auditor considers internal control relevant to the entity's preparation and fair presentation of the financial statement in order to design audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes evaluating the appropriateness of accounting policies used and the reasonableness of significant accounting estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall presentation of the financial statement. We believe that the audit evidence we have obtained is sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for our audit opinion.



To the People of Kentucky
Honorable Steven L. Beshear, Governor
Lori H. Flanery, Secretary
Finance and Administration Cabinet
Honorable Rick Newman, Muhlenberg County Judge/Executive
Members of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court

Basis for Adverse Opinion on U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles

As described in more fully in Note 1, the financial statement is prepared by Muhlenberg County, Kentucky on the basis of the accounting practices prescribed or permitted by the Department for Local Government to demonstrate compliance with the Commonwealth of Kentucky's regulatory basis of accounting and budget laws, which is a basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America.

The effects on the financial statement of the variances between the regulatory basis of accounting described in Note 1 and accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, although not reasonably determinable, are presumed to be material.

Adverse Opinion on U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles

In our opinion, because of the significance of the matter discussed in the Basis for Adverse Opinion on U.S. Generally Accepted Accounting Principles paragraph, the financial statement referred to above does not present fairly, in accordance with accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America, the financial position of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky as of June 30, 2014, or changes in financial position or cash flows thereof for the year then ended.

Opinion on Regulatory Basis of Accounting

In our opinion, the financial statement referred to above presents fairly, in all material respects, the fund balances of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky as of June 30, 2014, and its cash receipts and disbursements, for the year then ended, in accordance with the accounting practices prescribed or permitted by the Department for Local Government described in Note 1.

Other Matters

Other Information

Our audit was conducted for the purpose of forming an opinion on the financial statement taken as a whole of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky. The budgetary comparison schedules and capital asset schedule are presented for purposes of additional analysis and are not a required part of the financial statement, however they are required to be presented in accordance with accounting practices prescribed or permitted by the Department for Local Government to demonstrate compliance with the Commonwealth of Kentucky's regulatory basis of accounting and budget laws. The accompanying schedule of expenditures of federal awards is presented for purposes of additional analysis as required by U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations, and is not a required part of the financial statement. The budgetary comparison schedules, capital asset schedule, and the schedule of expenditures of federal awards is the responsibility of management and was derived from and relates directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statement. Such information has been subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statement and certain additional procedures, including comparing and reconciling such information directly to the underlying accounting and other records used to prepare the financial statement or to the financial statement itself, and other additional procedures in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. In our opinion, the budgetary comparison schedules, capital asset schedule, and the schedule of expenditures of federal awards are fairly stated in all material respects in relation to the basic financial statement.

To the People of Kentucky
Honorable Steven L. Beshear, Governor
Lori H. Flanery, Secretary
Finance and Administration Cabinet
Honorable Rick Newman, Muhlenberg County Judge/Executive
Members of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court

Other Reporting Required by Government Auditing Standards

In accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u>, we have also issued our report dated April 30, 2015 on our consideration of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky's internal control over financial reporting and on our tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements and other matters. The purpose of that report is to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over financial reporting and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the internal control over financial reporting or on compliance. That report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> in considering Muhlenberg County's internal control over financial reporting and compliance.

Based on the results of our audit, we present the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs included herein, which discusses the following report comments:

2014-001	The Fiscal Court Does Not Have Adequate Controls Over Decentralized Receipts
2014-002	Telephone Commissions Contracts Should Be Approved By Fiscal Court And All Jail
	Disbursements Should Be Budgeted
2014-003	Internal Controls Over Disbursements/Credit Cards Should Be Strengthened
2014-004	The Fiscal Court Should Advertise For And Award Bids In Accordance With KRS 424.260
2014-005	The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Activities Allowed Or
	Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, And Cash Management And Received Duplicate
	Reimbursements For The Same Costs
2014-006	The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting
	And Submitted A Materially Misstated Financial Report To The United States Department Of
	Commerce-Economic Development Administration
2014-007	The Fiscal Court Should Document Approval/Presentation Of All Expenditures Prior To Payment
2014-008	The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting
	For The Edward Byrne Grant And Had Questioned Costs Of \$12,832

Respectfully submitted,

Adam H. Edelen

Auditor of Public Accounts

April 30, 2015

MUHLENBERG COUNTY OFFICIALS

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

Fiscal Court Members:

Rick Newman County Judge/Executive

Daniel Bowles Magistrate
Cozy Chappell Magistrate
Darrin Benton Magistrate
Joe Glen Mitchell Magistrate
Tommy Watkins Magistrate

Other Elected Officials:

Darris Russell County Attorney

Mark Curry Jailer

Gaylan Spurlin County Clerk

Cameron Laycock Circuit Court Clerk

Curtis McGehee Sheriff

Bill Alward Property Valuation Administrator

Tony Armour Coroner

Appointed Personnel:

Charles Lewis County Treasurer
Laura Montgomery Finance Officer

MUHLENBERG COUNTY STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES - REGULATORY BASIS

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

MUHLENBERG COUNTY STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES - REGULATORY BASIS

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

	Budgeted Funds					
		General Fund		Road Fund		Jail Fund
RECEIPTS						
Taxes	\$	1,849,989	\$		\$	
In Lieu Tax Payments		3,043,880				
Excess Fees		1,463,335				
Licenses and Permits		372				
Intergovernmental		1,721,932		2,494,822		2,504,480
Charges for Services		350,640				17,630
Miscellaneous		819,546		524,512		151,577
Interest		3,323		,		•
Total Receipts		9,253,017		3,019,334		2,673,687
DISBURSEMENTS						
General Government		3,772,081				
Protection to Persons and Property		917,259				2,173,831
General Health and Sanitation		773,352				, ,
Social Services		332,857				
Recreation and Culture		343,371				
Roads		,		3,466,419		
Debt Service		875,046		688,563		
Capital Projects		1,272,582		,		
Administration		1,662,145		527,000		710,895
Total Disbursements		9,948,693		4,681,982		2,884,726
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over						
Disbursements Before Other						
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)		(695,676)		(1,662,648)		(211,039)
Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)						
Borrowed Money				784,202		
Transfers From Other Funds		1,591,829		750,000		250,000
Transfers To Other Funds		(1,875,046)				
Total Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)		(283,217)		1,534,202		250,000
Net Change in Fund Balance		(978,893)		(128,446)		38,961
Fund Balance - Beginning		3,182,399		240,865		55,930
Fund Balance - Ending	\$	2,203,506	\$	112,419	\$	94,891
Composition of Fund Balance						
Bank Balance	\$	1,709,690	\$	117,645	\$	96,395
Plus: Deposits In Transit	Ψ	1,.00,000	Ψ	11.,013	Ψ	, 5,5,5
Less: Outstanding Checks		(41,184)		(5,226)		(1,504)
Certificate of Deposits		535,000		(3,223)		(1,507)
Fund Balance - Ending	\$	2,203,506	\$	112,419	\$	94,891
		,,	_	.,	<u> </u>	. ,,

MUHLENBERG COUNTY STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended June 30, 2014 (Continued)

	Budgeted Funds												
]	Local Government Economic Assistance Fund				Narcotics Trails		Trails		Trails		Trails		Local overnment Economic evelopment Fund
\$		\$		\$		\$							
	1,201,653		731,680				876,325						
	138		27				6						
	1,201,791		731,707				876,331						
	40,000 118,650		569,469				65,000						
	510,900 543,915						92,140						
	1,213,465		569,469				157,140						
	, -,												
	(11,674)		162,238				719,191						
							875,046 (1,591,829) (716,783)						
	(11,674)		162,238				2,408						
	1,354,135		240,178	_	102,000		44,844						
\$	1,342,461	\$	402,416	\$	102,000	\$	47,252						
\$	1,342,461	\$	402,416	\$	102,000	\$	47,252						
\$	1,342,461	\$	402,416	\$	102,000	\$	47,252						

MUHLENBERG COUNTY STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS, DISBURSEMENTS, AND CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES - REGULATORY BASIS For The Year Ended June 30, 2014 (Continued)

	Unbudgeted Funds					
	Ju	stice				
	\mathbf{C}	enter				
	Corr	oration		Jail		
	_	unding	Co	mmissary		Total
		d Fund		Fund		Funds
RECEIPTS						
Taxes	\$		\$		\$	1,849,989
In Lieu Tax Payments	φ		φ		φ	3,043,880
Excess Fees						1,463,335
Licenses and Permits						372
		140,750		479,699		10,151,341
Intergovernmental Charges for Services		140,730		479,099		368,270
Miscellaneous						1,495,635
				10		
Interest		140.750		10		3,504
Total Receipts		140,750		479,709		18,376,326
DISBURSEMENTS						
General Government						3,877,081
Protection to Persons and Property						3,779,209
General Health and Sanitation						773,352
Social Services						332,857
Recreation and Culture						343,371
Roads						3,977,319
Debt Service		140,750		454,190		2,702,464
Capital Projects						1,364,722
Administration						2,900,040
Total Disbursements		140,750		454,190		20,050,415
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over						
Disbursements Before Other						
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)				25,519		(1,674,089)
Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)						
Borrowed Money						784,202
Transfers From Other Funds						3,466,875
Transfers To Other Funds						(3,466,875)
Total Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)						784,202
Net Change in Fund Balance				25,519		(889,887)
Fund Balance - Beginning		538		73,719		5,294,608
Fund Balance - Ending	\$	538	\$	99,238	\$	4,404,721
Composition of Fund Balance						
Bank Balance	\$	538	\$	104,101	\$	3,922,498
Deposits In Transit			•	1,287		1,287
Less Outstanding Checks				(6,150)		(54,064)
Certificate of Deposits				(0,120)		535,000
Ending Fund Balance	\$	538	\$	99,238	\$	4,404,721
-			_		_	

INDEX FOR NOTES TO THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Note 1.	SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT ACCOUNTING POLICIES	10
Note 2.	DEPOSITS	13
Note 3.	Transfers	13
Note 4.	ASSET HELD FOR RESALE	13
Note 5.	LONG-TERM DEBT	14
Note 6.	COMMITMENTS AND CONTINGENCIES	17
Note 7.	EMPLOYEE RETIREMENT SYSTEM	18
Note 8.	DEFERRED COMPENSATION	19
Note 9.	Insurance	19
NOTE 10.	RELATED PARTY TRANSACTIONS	19

MUHLENBERG COUNTY NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENT

June 30, 2014

Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

A. Reporting Entity

The financial statement of Muhlenberg County includes all budgeted and unbudgeted funds under the control of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court. Budgeted funds included within the reporting entity are those funds presented in the county's approved annual budget and reported on the quarterly reports submitted to the Department for Local Government. Unbudgeted funds may include non-fiduciary financial activities that are within the county's control. Unbudgeted funds may also include any corporation to act as the fiscal court in the acquisition and financing of any public project which may be undertaken by the fiscal court pursuant to the provisions of Kentucky law and thus accomplish a public purpose of the fiscal court. The unbudgeted funds are not presented in the annual approved budget or in the quarterly reports submitted to the Department for Local Government.

B. Basis of Accounting

The financial statement is presented on a regulatory basis of accounting, which is a basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) as established by the Government Accounting Standards Board. This basis of accounting involves the reporting of fund balances and the changes therein resulting from cash inflows (cash receipts) and cash outflows (cash disbursements) to meet the financial reporting requirements of the Department for Local Government and the laws of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

This regulatory basis of accounting differs from GAAP primarily because the financial statement format does not include the GAAP presentations of government-wide and fund financial statements, cash receipts are recognized when received in cash rather than when earned and susceptible to accrual, and cash disbursements are recognized when paid rather than when incurred or subject to accrual.

Generally and except as otherwise provided by law, property taxes are assessed as of January 1, levied (mailed) November 1, due at discount November 30, due at face value December 31, delinquent January 1 following the assessment, and subject to sale ninety days following April 15.

C. Basis of Presentation

Budgeted Funds

The fiscal court reports the following budgeted funds:

General Fund - This is the primary operating fund of the fiscal court. It accounts for all financial resources of the general government, except where the Department for Local Government requires a separate fund or where management requires that a separate fund be used for some function.

Road Fund - This fund is for road and bridge construction and repair. The primary source of receipts for this fund is state payments for truck licenses distribution, municipal road aid, and transportation grants. The Department for Local Government requires the fiscal court to maintain these receipts and disbursements separately from the General Fund.

Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

C. Basis of Presentation (Continued)

Jail Fund - The primary purpose of this fund is to account for the jail expenses of the county. The primary sources of receipts for this fund are reimbursements from the state and federal government, payments from other counties for housing prisoners, and transfers from the General Fund. The Department for Local Government requires the fiscal court to maintain these receipts and disbursements separately from the General Fund.

Local Government Economic Assistance Fund - The primary purpose of this fund is to account for grants and related disbursements. The primary sources of receipts for this fund are grants from the state and federal governments.

Pennyrile Narcotics Fund - The primary purpose of this fund is to account for the activity of a tri county drug enforcement agency. The primary sources of receipts for this fund are grants from the federal government and contributions from other local governments.

Rails to Trails Fund - The primary purpose of this fund is to account for grants and related disbursements for the development of a walking trail. The primary sources of receipts for this fund are grants from the state government.

Local Government Economic Development Fund - The primary purpose of this fund is to account for grants and related disbursements. The primary sources of receipts for this fund are from the state government.

Unbudgeted Funds

The fiscal court reports the following unbudgeted funds:

Justice Center Corporation Refunding Bond Fund - The primary purpose of this fund is to account for the proceeds and debt service of refunding revenue bonds that were issued to fund construction of the Justice Center.

Jail Commissary Fund - The canteen operations are authorized pursuant to KRS 441.135(1), which allows the jailer to sell snacks, sodas, and other items to inmates. The profits generated from the sale of those items are to be used for the benefit and to enhance the well-being of the inmates. KRS 441.135(2) requires the jailer to maintain accounting records and report annually to the county treasurer the receipts and disbursements of the Jail Commissary Fund.

D. Budgetary Information

Annual budgets are adopted on a regulatory basis of accounting, which is a basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) as established by the Government Accounting Standards Board and according to the laws of Kentucky as required by the State Local Finance Officer.

The County Judge/Executive is required to submit estimated receipts and proposed disbursement to the fiscal court by May 1 of each year. The budget is prepared by fund, function, and activity and is required to be adopted by the fiscal court by July 1.

The fiscal court may change the original budget by transferring appropriations at the activity level; however, the fiscal court may not increase the total budget without approval by the State Local Finance Officer. Disbursements may not exceed budgeted appropriations at the activity level.

Note 1. Summary of Significant Accounting Policies (Continued)

D. Budgetary Information (Continued)

The State Local Finance Officer does not require the Jail Commissary Fund to be budgeted because the fiscal court does not approve the expenses of these funds.

The State Local Finance Officer does not require the Justice Center Corporation Fund or the General Obligation Bond to be budgeted. Bond indentures and other relevant contractual provisions require specific payments to and from this fund annually.

E. Muhlenberg County Elected Officials

Kentucky law provides for election of the officials below from the geographic area constituting Muhlenberg County. Pursuant to state statute, these officials perform various services for the Commonwealth of Kentucky, its judicial courts, the fiscal court, various cities and special districts within the county, and the board of education. In exercising these responsibilities, however, they are required to comply with state laws. Audits of their financial statements are issued separately and individually and can be obtained from their respective administrative offices. These financial statements are not required to be included in the financial statement of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky.

- Circuit Court Clerk
- County Attorney
- Property Valuation Administrator
- County Clerk
- County Sheriff

F. Deposits and Investments

The government's fund balance is considered to be cash on hand, demand deposits, certificates of deposit, and short-term investments with original maturities of three months or less from the date of acquisition. The government's fund balance includes cash and cash equivalents and investments.

KRS 66.480 authorizes the county to invest in the following, including but not limited to, obligations of the United States and of its agencies and instrumentalities, obligations and contracts for future delivery or purchase of obligations backed by the full faith and credit of the United States, obligations of any corporation of the United States government, bonds or certificates of indebtedness of this state, and certificates of deposit issued by or other interest-bearing accounts of any bank or savings and loan institution which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) or which are collateralized, to the extent uninsured, by any obligation permitted by KRS 41.240(4).

G. Long-term Obligations

The fund financial statement recognizes bond interest, as well as bond issuance costs when received or when paid, during the current period. The principal amount of the debt and interest are reported as disbursements. Issuance costs, whether or not withheld from the actual debt proceeds received, are reported as disbursements. Debt proceeds are reported as other adjustments to cash.

Note 2. Deposits

The fiscal Court maintained deposits of public funds with depository institutions insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC) as required by KRS 66.480(1)(d). According to KRS 41.240(4), the depository institution should pledge or provide sufficient collateral which, together with FDIC insurance, equals or exceeds the amount of public funds on deposit at all times. In order to be valid against the FDIC in the event of failure or insolvency of the depository institution, this pledge or provision of collateral should be evidenced by an agreement between the fiscal court and the depository institution, signed by both parties, that is (a) in writing, (b) approved by the board of directors of the depository institution or its loan committee, which approval must be reflected in the minutes of the board or committee, and (c) an official record of the depository institution.

Custodial Credit Risk - Deposits

Custodial credit risk is the risk that in the event of a depository institution failure, the government's deposits may not be returned. The government does not have a deposit policy for custodial credit risk, but rather follows the requirements of KRS 41.240(4). As of June 30, 2014, public funds were exposed to custodial credit risk because the bank did not adequately collateralize the fiscal court's deposits in accordance with the security agreement.

• Uncollateralized and Uninsured \$213,894

Note 3. Transfers

The table below shows the interfund operating transfers for fiscal year 2014.

	General Fund	LC	GEDF Fund	Total Transfers In		
General Fund	\$		\$	1,591,829	\$	1,591,829
Road Fund		750,000				750,000
Jail Fund		250,000				250,000
LGEDF Fund		875,046				875,046
Total Transfers Out	\$	1,875,046	\$	1,591,829	\$	3,466,875

Reason for transfers:

To move resources from and to the General Fund and other funds, for budgetary purposes, to the funds that will expend them.

Note 4. Asset Held For Resale

Assets Held for Resale

	Beginning Balance		A	dditions	R	eductions_	Ending Balance		
Vehicles and Equipment	\$	547,704	\$	558,732	\$	547,704	\$	558,732	
Total	\$	547,704	\$	558,732	\$	547,704	\$	558,732	

Note 5. Long-term Debt

A. General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2007 (Detention Center)

On March 1, 2007, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court issued \$6,255,000 General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2007, for the purpose of (i) refunding, in advance of maturity, the outstanding County of Muhlenberg, Kentucky General Obligation Improvement Bonds (Detention Facilities Project), Series 2000 and (ii) paying the costs of issuing the bonds. Interest on the bonds will be payable semi-annually on February 1 and August 1 of each year commencing August 1, 2007. The interest rate on the bonds ranges from 3.5% to 3.75%. The bonds will mature on August 1 of each year beginning August 1, 2007. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014 was \$3,705,000. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended June 30	Principal			Scheduled Interest			
Julie 30		Filicipai		merest			
2015	\$	405,000	\$	129,324			
2016		430,000		114,190			
2017		435,000		98,512			
2018		450,000		82,415			
2019		470,000		65,508			
2020-2022		1,515,000		86,719			
Totals	\$	3,705,000	\$	576,668			

B. General Obligation Refunding and Improvement Bonds, Series 2011 (Courthouse)

On March 3, 2011, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court issued \$11,765,000 General Obligation Refunding and Improvement Bonds, Series 2011, for the purpose of courthouse renovations. Interest on the bonds will be payable semi-annually on April 1 and October 1 of each year commencing October 1, 2011. The interest rate on the bonds range from 2.25% and 4.75%. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014 was \$10,440,000. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended			Scheduled		
June 30	_ <u>I</u>	Principal	Interest		
2015	\$	465,000	\$	409,809	
2016		475,000		398,184	
2017		490,000		385,715	
2018		500,000		372,240	
2019		515,000		357,240	
2020-2024		2,865,000		1,500,583	
2025-2029		3,500,000		871,700	
2030-2031		1,630,000		117,087	
Totals	\$ 1	\$ 10,440,000		4,412,558	

Note 5. Long-term Debt (Continued)

C. First Mortgage Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2012 (Justice Center)

On April 5, 2012, the Muhlenberg County Justice Center Corporation ("The Corporation") issued \$4,570,000 First Mortgage Refunding Revenue Bonds (Judicial Center Project), Series 2012, for the purpose of (i) advance partial refunding the \$6,955,000 Muhlenberg County, Kentucky Justice Center Corporation First Mortgage Revenue Bonds, Series 2002, the proceeds of which were used for the construction of a Judicial Center facility ("Prior Bonds"); (ii) paying accrued interest, if any; and (iii) paying the cost of issuance incurred with respect to the issuance of the Bonds Interest on the Bonds is payable each March 1 and September 1, beginning September 1, 2012. The Bonds will mature on September 1 of each year beginning September 1, 2013. The interest rate on the bonds ranges from 1.0% to 2.75%.

The Corporation, the County and the Administrative Office of the Courts ("AOC") have entered into a Lease Agreement dated as of April 5, 2012 (the "Lease"), wherein the AOC will lease form the Corporation the Project Sire (as described herein), at an agreed rental, which rental amount will be assigned by the Corporation to the Trustee and is anticipated to be adequate to pay approximately 100% of the principal and interest on the Bonds. The Lease does not require the County to make any rental payments toward the Project; however, the County is obligated to provide for the operation, maintenance, insurance and repair of the Project. On May 1 of each even numbered year, this lease may be renewed by AOC for another biennial period of two years.

Bonds outstanding as of June 30, 2014 totaled \$4,530,000. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended June 30	Principal	Scheduled Interest		
2015	\$ 415,000	\$	98,475	
2016	420,000		92,200	
2017	430,000		83,700	
2018	440,000		75,000	
2019	445,000		66,150	
2020-2024	2,380,000		168,525	
	·	-	_	
Totals	\$ 4,530,000	\$	584,050	

D. Gradall Loan

On April 13, 2010, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court entered into a 5-year loan agreement with First National Bank for the purchase of a Gradall. The principal amount borrowed was \$309,800 with an interest rate of 3.85%. The agreement requires monthly principal and interest payments. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014, was \$55,709. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended		Scheduled			
June 30	P	rincipal	Interest		
2015	\$	55,709	\$	1,064	
Totals	\$	55,709	\$	1,064	

Note 5. Long-term Debt (Continued)

E. Caterpillar Tractor Loan

On August 1, 2011, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court entered into a 4-year loan agreement with First National Bank for the purchase of a Caterpillar Tractor. The principal amount borrowed was \$207,860 with an interest rate of 3.40%. The agreement requires monthly principal and interest payments. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014, was \$12,099. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended	Scheduled				
June 30	P	rincipal	Interest		
2015	\$	12,099	\$	66	
Totals	\$	12,099	\$	66	

F. Lease – Four Trucks

On December 5, 2012, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court entered into a 19-month lease purchase agreement with the Kentucky Association of Counties Leasing Trust Program for the purpose of purchasing four trucks. The principal amount borrowed with \$500,000 with an interest rate of 4.55%. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014, was \$0.

G. Lease - Mack Truck

On December 19, 2013, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court entered into an 18-month lease purchase agreement with the Kentucky Association of Counties Leasing Trust Program for the purpose of purchasing a Mack truck. The principal amount borrowed was \$128,028 with an interest rate of 4.55%. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014, was \$128,028. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended				Scheduled			
June 30	F	Principal	Interest				
2015	\$	128,028	\$	5,324			
Totals	\$	128,028	\$	5,324			

H. Lease – Mack Trucks

On October 8, 2013, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court entered into an 18-month lease purchase agreement with the Kentucky Association of Counties Leasing Trust Program for the purpose of purchasing three Mack trucks. The principal amount borrowed was \$430,704 with an interest rate of 4.55%. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014, was \$430,704. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended				Scheduled			
June 30	I	Principal	Interest				
2015	\$	430,704	\$	14,678			
Totals	•	430,704	•	14,678			
1 Otals	Ψ	430,704	Ψ	14,076			

Note 5. Long-term Debt (Continued)

I. Caterpillar Grader Loan

On December 16, 2013, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court entered into a 4-year loan agreement with the First Kentucky for the purchase of a Caterpillar 120M2 Grader. The principal amount borrowed was \$225,470 with an interest rate of 2.44%. The agreement requires monthly principal and interest payments. The outstanding balance as of June 30, 2014, was \$204,118. Future principal and interest requirements are:

Fiscal Year Ended			Scheduled		
June 30	I	Principal	I	nterest	
2015	\$	43,427	\$	4,561	
2016		44,505		3,484	
2017		45,627		2,361	
2018		50,719		1,268	
2019		19,840		125	
Totals	\$	204,118	\$	11,799	

J. Changes In Long-term Debt

Long-term Debt activity for the year ended June 30, 2014, was as follows:

	Beginning Balance	 Additions	Re	eductions	Ending Balance		ue Within One Year
General Obligation Bonds Revenue Bonds Financing Obligations	\$ 15,000,000 4,570,000 703,551	\$ 784,202	\$	855,000 40,000 657,095	\$14,145,000 4,530,000 830,658	\$	870,000 415,000 669,967
Total Long-term Debt	\$ 20,273,551	\$ 784,202	\$ 1	,552,095	\$19,505,658	\$ 1	1,954,967

Note 6. Commitments and Contingencies

The County is involved in a lawsuit that arose from the normal course of doing business. Due to the uncertainty of the litigation, a reasonable estimate of the financial impact on the county cannot be made at this time.

Note 7. Employee Retirement System

The fiscal court has elected to participate in the County Employees Retirement System (CERS), pursuant to KRS 78.530 administered by the Board of Trustees of the Kentucky Retirement Systems. This is a cost sharing, multiple employer defined benefit pension plan, which covers all eligible full-time employees and provides for retirement, disability and death benefits to plan members. Benefit contributions and provisions are established by statute.

Nonhazardous covered employees are required to contribute 5 percent of their salary to the plan. Nonhazardous covered employees who begin participation on or after September 1, 2008 are required to contribute 6 percent of their salary to the plan. The county's contribution rate for nonhazardous employees was 18.89 percent.

The county's contribution for FY 2012 was \$829,311, FY 2013 was \$905,186, and FY 2014 was \$933,803.

Benefits fully vest on reaching five years of service for nonhazardous employees. Aspects of benefits for nonhazardous employees include retirement after 27 years of service or age 65. Nonhazardous employees who begin participation on or after September 1, 2008 must meet the rule of 87 (members age plus years of service credit must equal 87, and the member must be a minimum of 57 years of age) or the member is age 65, with a minimum of 60 months service credit.

CERS also provides post retirement health care coverage as follows:

For members participating prior to July 1, 2003, years of service and respective percentages of the maximum contribution are as follows:

Years of Service	% paid by Insurance Fund	% Paid by Member through Payroll Deduction
20 or more	100%	0%
15-19	75%	25%
10-14	50%	50%
4-9	25%	75%
Less than 4	0%	100%

As a result of House Bill 290 (2004 General Assembly), medical insurance benefits are calculated differently for members who began participation on or after July 1, 2003. Once members reach a minimum vesting period of ten years, non-hazardous employees whose participation began on or after July 1, 2003, earn ten dollars per month for insurance benefits at retirement for every year of earned service without regard to a maximum dollar amount.

Historical trend information showing the CERS' progress in accumulating sufficient assets to pay benefits when due is presented in the Kentucky Retirement Systems' annual financial report. This report may be obtained by writing the Kentucky Retirement Systems, 1260 Louisville Road, Frankfort, KY 40601-6124, or by telephone at (502) 564-4646.

Note 8. Deferred Compensation

On February 24, 2000, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court voted to allow all eligible employees to participate in deferred compensation plans administered by The Kentucky Public Employees' Deferred Compensation Authority. The Kentucky Public Employees' Deferred Compensation Authority is authorized under KRS 18A.230 to 18A.275 to provide administration of tax sheltered supplemental retirement plans for all state, public school and university employees and employees of local political subdivisions that have elected to participate.

These deferred compensation plans permits all full time employees to defer a portion of their salary until future years. The deferred compensation is not available to employees until termination, retirement, death, or unforeseeable emergency. Participation by eligible employees in the deferred compensation plans is voluntary.

Historical trend information showing The Kentucky Public Employees' Deferred Compensation Authority's progress in accumulating sufficient assets to pay benefits when due is presented in The Kentucky Public Employees' Deferred Compensation Authority's annual financial report. This report may be obtained by writing Kentucky Public Employees' Deferred Compensation Authority at 101 Sea Hero Road, Suite 110, Frankfort, KY 40601-8862, or by telephone at (502) 573-7925.

Note 9. Insurance

For the fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, Muhlenberg County was a member of the Kentucky Association of Counties' All Lines Fund (KALF). KALF is a self-insurance fund and was organized to obtain lower cost coverage for general liability, property damage, public officials' errors and omissions, public liability, and other damages. The basic nature of a self-insurance program is that of a collectively shared risk by its members. If losses incurred for covered claims exceed the resources contributed by the members, the members are responsible for payment of the excess losses.

Note 10. Related Party Transactions

The Muhlenberg County Treasurer is a compensated member of the Board of Directors at First Security Bank where the Fiscal Court maintains a certificate of deposit.



MUHLENBERG COUNTY BUDGRTARY COMPARISON SCHEDULES Supplementary Information - Regulatory Basis

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

MUHLENBERG COUNTY BUDGETARY COMPARISON SCHEDULES Supplementary Information - Regulatory Basis

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

GENERAL FUND

Budgeted Amounts Original Final			Actual Amounts, (Budgetary Basis)	Variance with Final Budget Positive (Negative)		
RECEIPTS						
Taxes	\$ 1,791,500	\$ 1,791,500	\$ 1,849,989	\$ 58,489		
In Lieu Tax Payments	2,600,000	2,600,000	3,043,880	443,880		
Excess Fees	1,410,000	1,410,000	1,463,335	53,335		
Licenses and Permits	37,500	37,500	372	(37,128)		
Intergovernmental	2,063,050	2,063,050	1,721,932	(341,118)		
Charges for Services	316,600	316,600	350,640	34,040		
Miscellaneous	675,600	675,600	819,546	143,946		
Interest	3,500	3,500	3,323	(177)		
Total Receipts	8,897,750	8,897,750	9,253,017	355,267		
DISBURSEMENTS						
General Government	3,710,200	4,132,450	3,772,081	360,369		
Protection to Persons and Property	1,238,250	1,062,450	917,259	145,191		
General Health and Sanitation	1,041,000	1,042,000	773,352	268,648		
Social Services	202,500	348,500	332,857	15,643		
Recreation and Culture	673,800	556,300	343,371	212,929		
Debt Service	1,010,000	20,050	875,046	(854,996)		
Capital Projects	1,513,000	2,018,000	1,272,582	745,418		
Administration	2,033,000	1,774,000	1,662,145	111,855		
Total Disbursements	11,421,750	10,953,750	9,948,693	1,005,057		
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over Disbursements Before Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)	(2,524,000)	(2,056,000)	(695,676)	1,360,324		
ragisticitis to Cash (Oscs)	(2,324,000)	(2,030,000)	(075,070)	1,300,324		
Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)						
Transfers From Other Funds			1,591,829	1,591,829		
Transfers To Other Funds	(1,306,800)	(1,306,800)	(1,875,046)	(568,246)		
Borrowed Money	1,000,000	1,000,000		(1,000,000)		
Total Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)	(306,800)	(306,800)	(283,217)	23,583		
Net Change in Fund Balance	(2,830,800)	(2,362,800)	(978,893)	1,383,907		
Fund Balance Beginning	2,830,800	2,830,800	3,182,399	351,599		
Fund Balance - Ending	\$ 0	\$ 468,000	\$ 2,203,506	\$ 1,735,506		

	ROAD FUND								
		Budgeted Amounts			Actual Amounts, (Budgetary Basis)		Fi	riance with nal Budget Positive	
	Original			Final			(Negative)		
RECEIPTS									
Intergovernmental	\$	2,388,250	\$	2,388,250	\$	2,494,822	\$	106,572	
Miscellaneous		455,000		455,000		524,512		69,512	
Total Receipts		2,843,250		2,843,250	_	3,019,334		176,084	
DISBURSEMENTS									
Roads		2,287,400		2,729,600		3,466,419		(736,819)	
Debt Service		663,900		689,700		688,563		1,137	
Administration		527,000		527,000		527,000			
Total Disbursements		3,478,300		3,946,300		4,681,982		(735,682)	
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over									
Disbursements Before Other									
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)		(635,050)	_	(1,103,050)		(1,662,648)		(559,598)	
Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)									
Borrowed Money						784,202		784,202	
Transfers From Other Funds		585,050		585,050		750,000		164,950	
Total Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)		585,050		585,050		1,534,202		949,152	
Net Change in Fund Balance		(50,000)		(518,000)		(128,446)		389,554	
Fund Balance Beginning		50,000		50,000		240,865		190,865	
Fund Balance - Ending	\$	0	\$	(468,000)	\$	112,419	\$	580,419	

	JAIL FUND								
	Budgeted <i>A</i> Original		l Amounts Final		Actual Amounts, (Budgetary Basis)		Fi	riance with nal Budget Positive Negative)	
RECEIPTS		011811111				<i>Duolo</i>		(toguire)	
Intergovernmental	\$	2,115,000	\$	2,115,000	\$	2,504,480	\$	389,480	
Charges for Services		14,000		14,000		17,630		3,630	
Miscellaneous		157,500		157,500		151,577		(5,923)	
Total Receipts		2,286,500		2,286,500		2,673,687		387,187	
DISBURSEMENTS									
Protection to Persons and Property		2,338,250		2,338,250		2,173,831		164,419	
Administration		720,000		720,000		710,895		9,105	
Total Disbursements		3,058,250		3,058,250		2,884,726		173,524	
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over									
Disbursements Before Other									
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)	-	(771,750)		(771,750)		(211,039)		560,711	
Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)									
Transfers From Other Funds		721,750		721,750		250,000		(471,750)	
Total Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)		721,750		721,750		250,000		(471,750)	
Net Change in Fund Balance		(50,000)		(50,000)		38,961		88,961	
Fund Balance Beginning		50,000		50,000		55,930		5,930	
Fund Balance - Ending	\$	0	\$	0	\$	94,891	\$	94,891	

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE FUND

	 Budgeted Amounts Original Final			Actual Amounts, Budgetary Basis)	F	ariance with Final Budget Positive (Negative)
RECEIPTS						
Intergovernmental	\$ 1,085,000	\$	1,085,000	\$ 1,201,653	\$	116,653
Interest	 100		100	 138		38
Total Receipts	 1,085,100		1,085,100	 1,201,791		116,691
DISBURSEMENTS						
General Government	40,000		40,000	40,000		
Protection to Persons and Property	118,650		118,650	118,650		
Roads	550,000		550,000	510,900		39,100
Debt Service	543,915		543,915	543,915		
Total Disbursements	 1,252,565		1,252,565	1,213,465		39,100
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over Disbursements Before Other						
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)	 (167,465)		(167,465)	 (11,674)		155,791
Net Change in Fund Balance	(167,465)		(167,465)	(11,674)		155,791
Fund Balance Beginning	 167,465		167,465	 1,354,135		1,186,670
Fund Balance - Ending	\$ 0	\$	0	\$ 1,342,461	\$	1,342,461

	PENNYRILE NARCOTICS FUND								
		Budgeted Amounts Original Final					Variance with Final Budget Positive (Negative)		
RECEIPTS									
Intergovernmental	\$	830,000	\$	830,000	\$	731,680	\$	(98,320)	
Interest		100		100		27		(73)	
Total Receipts		830,100		830,100		731,707		(98,393)	
DISBURSEMENTS									
Protection to Persons and Property		840,000		840,000		569,469		270,531	
Total Disbursements		840,000		840,000		569,469		270,531	
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over									
Disbursements Before Other									
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)	-	(9,900)		(9,900)		162,238		172,138	
Net Change in Fund Balance		(9,900)		(9,900)		162,238		172,138	
Fund Balance Beginning		9,900		9,900		240,178		230,278	
Fund Balance - Ending	\$	0	\$	0	\$	402,416	\$	402,416	

	RAILS TO TRAILS FUND								
		Budgeted	Amo	ounts	Actual Amounts, (Budgetary Basis)		Fi	riance with nal Budget Positive	
		Original		Final			(Negative)		
RECEIPTS								_	
Intergovernmental	\$	100,000	\$	100,000	\$		\$	(100,000)	
Total Receipts		100,000		100,000				(100,000)	
DISBURSEMENTS									
Capital Projects		202,000		202,000				202,000	
Total Disbursements		202,000		202,000				202,000	
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over									
Disbursements Before Other									
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)		(102,000)		(102,000)				102,000	
Net Change in Fund Balance		(102,000)		(102,000)				102,000	
Fund Balance Beginning		102,000		102,000		102,000			
Fund Balance - Ending	\$	0	\$	0	\$	102,000	\$	102,000	

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FUND

	 Budgeted Amounts Original Final			Actual Amounts, Budgetary Basis)	Variance with Final Budget Positive (Negative)	
RECEIPTS						
Intergovernmental	\$ 2,374,455	\$	2,374,455	\$ 876,325	\$	(1,498,130)
Interest	 			 6		6
Total Receipts	 2,374,455		2,374,455	 876,331		(1,498,124)
DISBURSEMENTS						
General Government	125,000		125,000	65,000		60,000
Recreation and Culture	17,100		17,100			17,100
Debt Service	1,055,000		1,055,000			1,055,000
Capital Projects	 1,177,355		1,177,355	92,140		1,085,215
Total Disbursements	2,374,455		2,374,455	 157,140		2,217,315
Excess (Deficiency) of Receipts Over						
Disbursements Before Other						
Adjustments to Cash (Uses)	 			719,191		719,191
Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)						
Transfers From Other Funds				875,046		875,046
Transfers To Other Funds				(1,591,829)		(1,591,829)
Total Other Adjustments to Cash (Uses)				(716,783)		(716,783)
Net Change in Fund Balance				2,408		2,408
Fund Balance Beginning	 			44,844		44,844
Fund Balance - Ending	\$ 0	\$	0	\$ 47,252	\$	47,252

MUHLENBERG COUNTY NOTES TO REGULATORY SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION - BUDGETARY COMPARISON SCHEDULES

June 30, 2014

Note 1. Budgetary Information

Annual budgets are adopted on a regulatory basis of accounting, which is a basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) as established by the Government Accounting Standards Board and according to the laws of Kentucky as required by the State Local Finance Officer.

The County Judge/Executive is required to submit estimated receipts and proposed disbursements to the fiscal court by May 1 of each year. The budget is prepared by fund, function, and activity and is required to be adopted by the fiscal court by July 1.

The fiscal court may change the original budget by transferring appropriations at the activity level; however, the fiscal court may not increase the total budget without approval by the State Local Finance Officer. Disbursements may not exceed budgeted appropriations at the activity level.

Note 2. Excess of Disbursements Over Appropriations

General Fund - Debt Service disbursements exceeded budgeted appropriations by \$854,996.

Road Fund - Road disbursements exceeded budgeted appropriations by \$736,819.

MUHLENBERG COUNTY SUPPLEMENTARY SCHEDULE Supplementary Information - Regulatory Basis

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

MUHLENBERG COUNTY SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS Supplementary Information - Regulatory Basis

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

The fiscal court reports the following schedule of capital assets:

	Beginning			Ending
	Balance	Additions	Deletions	Balance
Land	\$ 2,047,585	\$	\$	\$ 2,047,585
Land Improvements	148,693	27,020		175,713
Construction In Progress		1,033,286		1,033,286
Buildings	31,683,193			31,683,193
Vehicles and Equipment	5,805,138	769,247	40,429	6,533,956
Infrastructure	284,617	94,515		379,132
Total Capital Assets	\$ 39,969,226	\$ 1,924,068	\$ 40,429	\$41,852,865

MUHLENBERG COUNTY NOTES TO REGULATORY SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION - SCHEDULE OF CAPITAL ASSETS

June 30, 2014

Note 1. Capital Assets

Capital assets, which include land, land improvements, buildings, furniture and office equipment, building improvements, machinery, equipment, and infrastructure assets (roads and bridges) that have a useful life of more than one reporting period based on the government's capitalization policy, are reported as other information. Such assets are recorded at historical cost or estimated historical cost when purchased or constructed.

	Cap	italization	Useful Life	
	T1	nreshold	(Years)	
Land Improvements	\$	10,000	10-60	
Buildings and Building Improvements	\$	10,000	10-75	
Machinery and Equipment	\$	2,500	3-25	
Vehicles	\$	2,500	3-25	
Infrastructure	\$	10,000	10-50	

MUHLENBERG COUNTY SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS

MUHLENBERG COUNTY SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014

Federal Grantor		Pass-Through		
CFDA#	Program Title	Grantor's Number	E	Expenditures
U. S. Department of Commerce - Econ	omic Development Administration			
Direct Program				
11.300 Investments for Public Work	s and Economic Development Facilities	04-69-06556	** _\$	364,130
Total U.S. Department of Commerce				364,130
U.S. Department of Homeland Security	<u>y</u>			
Passed-Through State Department of	Military Affaira			
97.042 Emergency Management Per	• 00			14,332
Total U.S. Department of Homeland S	ecurity			14,332
Department of Housing and Urban De	velopment			
Passed-Through State Department for 14.228 Community Development Blo		10-004	**	461,647
14.228 Confinding Development Di	ock Granis/State's Frogram	10-004	· ·	401,047
Total U.S. Department of Housing and	l Urban Development			461,647
U.S. Department of Justice				
Passed-Through State Department of .	Justice:			
16.738 Edward Byrne Memorial Jus	tice Assistance Grant Program	2013-JAG-Pennrile-00956	**	298,544
Total U.S. Department of Justice				298,544
Total Expenditures of Federal Awards			\$	1,138,653

^{**}Tested as Major Program or Cluster

MUHLENBERG COUNTY NOTES TO THE SCHEDULE OF EXPENDITURES OF FEDERAL AWARDS Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014

Note 1 - The accompanying Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards includes the federal grant activity of Muhlenberg County, Kentucky and is presented on a regulatory basis of accounting other than accounting principles generally accepted in the United States of America (GAAP) as established by the Government Accounting Standards Board. The information in this schedule is presented in accordance with the requirements of OMB Circular A-133, Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations.

REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER FINANCIAL REPORTING AND ON COMPLIANCE AND OTHER MATTERS BASED ON AN AUDIT OF THE FINANCIAL STATEMENT PERFORMED IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNMENT AUDITING STANDARDS



ADAM H. EDELEN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

The Honorable Rick Newman, Muhlenberg County Judge/Executive Members of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court

Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of The Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards

Independent Auditor's Report

We have audited, in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> issued by the Comptroller General of the United States, the Statement of Receipts, Disbursements, and Changes in Fund Balances - Regulatory Basis of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, and the related notes to the financial statement and have issued our report thereon dated April 30, 2015. The Fiscal Court's financial statement is prepared on a regulatory basis of accounting, which demonstrates compliance with the laws of Kentucky and is a special purpose framework.

Internal Control Over Financial Reporting

In planning and performing our audit of the financial statement, we considered the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court's internal control over financial reporting to determine the audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing our opinions on the financial statement, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court's internal control. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court's internal control.

Our consideration of internal control over financial reporting was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. However, as described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control that we consider to be material weaknesses.

A *deficiency in internal control* exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct misstatements on a timely basis. A *material weakness* is a deficiency, or a combination of deficiencies, in internal control, such that there is a reasonable possibility that a material misstatement of the entity's financial statement will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. We consider the deficiencies described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as items 2014-001, 2014-003, 2014-005, 2014-006, 2014-007, and 2014-008 to be material weaknesses.



Report On Internal Control Over Financial Reporting And On Compliance And Other Matters Based On An Audit Of Financial Statement Performed In Accordance With Government Auditing Standards (Continued)

Compliance And Other Matters

As part of obtaining reasonable assurance about whether the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court's financial statement is free of material misstatement, we performed tests of its compliance with certain provisions of laws, regulations, contracts, and grant agreements, noncompliance with which could have a direct and material effect on the determination of financial statement amounts. However, providing an opinion on compliance with those provisions was not an objective of our audit and, accordingly, we do not express such an opinion. The results of our tests disclosed instances of noncompliance or other matters that are required to be reported under <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> and which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as items 2014-001, 2014-002, 2014-004, and 2014-007.

County Judge's Responses to Findings

The Muhlenberg County Judge's responses to the findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. The County Judge's responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of the financial statement and, accordingly, we express no opinion on them.

Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control and compliance and the results of that testing, and not to provide an opinion on the effectiveness of the entity's internal control or on compliance. This report is an integral part of an audit performed in accordance with <u>Government Auditing Standards</u> in considering the entity's internal control and compliance. Accordingly, this communication is not suitable for any other purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam H. Edelen

Auditor of Public Accounts

April 30, 2015

REPORT ON COMPLIANCE FOR EACH MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAM AND REPORT ON INTERNAL CONTROL OVER COMPLIANCE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OMB CIRCULAR A-133



ADAM H. EDELEN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS

The Honorable Rick Newman, Muhlenberg County Judge/Executive Members of the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court

Report On Compliance For Each Major Federal Program And Report On Internal Control Over Compliance In Accordance With OMB Circular A-133

Independent Auditor's Report

Report on Compliance for Each Major Federal Program

We have audited Muhlenberg County, Kentucky's compliance with the types of compliance requirements described in the U.S. Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-133 *Compliance Supplement* that could have a direct and material effect on each of Muhlenberg County's major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2014. Muhlenberg County's major federal programs are identified in the summary of auditor's results section of the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs.

Management's Responsibility

Management is responsible for compliance with the requirements of laws, regulations, contracts, and grants applicable to its federal programs.

Auditor's Responsibility

Our responsibility is to express an opinion on compliance for each of Muhlenberg County's major federal programs based on our audit of the types of compliance requirements referred to above. We conducted our audit of compliance in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America; the standards applicable to financial audits contained in *Government Auditing Standards*, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States; and OMB Circular A-133, *Audits of States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations*. Those standards and OMB Circular A-133 require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether noncompliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on a major federal program occurred. An audit includes examining, on a test basis, evidence about Muhlenberg County's compliance with those requirements and performing such other procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

We believe that our audit provides a reasonable basis for our opinion on compliance for each major federal program. However, our audit does not provide a legal determination of Muhlenberg County's compliance.

Basis for Modified Opinion on Investments for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities

As described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs, Muhlenberg County did not comply with requirements regarding CFDA 11.300 Investments for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities as described in finding numbers 2014-005 for Activities Allowed or Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, and Cash Management and 2014-006 for Reporting. Compliance with such requirements is necessary, in our opinion, for Muhlenberg County to comply with the requirements applicable to that program.



Report On Compliance For Each Major Federal Program And Report On Internal Control Over Compliance In Accordance With OMB Circular A-133 (Continued)

Modified Opinion on Investments for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities

In our opinion, except for the noncompliances described in the Basis for Modified Opinion paragraph, Muhlenberg County complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on CFDA 11.300 Investments for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities for the year ended June 30, 2014.

Unmodified Opinion on Each of the Other Major Federal Programs

In our opinion, Muhlenberg County complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its other major federal programs identified in the summary of auditor's results section of the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs for the year ended June 30, 2014.

Other Matters

The results of our auditing procedures disclosed other instances of noncompliance with the compliance requirements referred to above that are required to be reported in accordance with OMB Circular A-133 and which are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as items 2014-003 and 2014-004. Our opinion on each major federal program is not modified with respect to these matters.

Muhlenberg County's responses to the noncompliance findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. Muhlenberg County's response was not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the response.

Report on Internal Control over Compliance

Management of Muhlenberg County is responsible for establishing and maintaining effective internal control over compliance with the types of compliance requirements referred to above. In planning and performing our audit of compliance, we considered Muhlenberg County's internal control over compliance with the types of requirements that could have a direct and material effect on each major federal program as a basis for designing auditing procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances for the purpose of expressing an opinion on compliance for each major federal program and to test and report on internal control over compliance in accordance with OMB Circular A-133, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of internal control over compliance. Accordingly, we do not express an opinion on the effectiveness of Muhlenberg County.

Our consideration of internal control over compliance was for the limited purpose described in the preceding paragraph and was not designed to identify all deficiencies in internal control over compliance that might be material weaknesses or significant deficiencies, and therefore, material weaknesses or significant deficiencies may exist that were not identified. However, as discussed below, we identified certain deficiencies in internal control over compliance that we consider to be material weaknesses and significant deficiencies.

Report On Compliance For Each Major Federal Program And Report On Internal Control Over Compliance In Accordance With OMB Circular A-133 (Continued)

Report on Internal Control over Compliance (Continued)

A deficiency in internal control over compliance exists when the design or operation of a control over compliance does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent, or detect and correct noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program on a timely basis. A material weakness in internal control over compliance is a deficiency, or combination of deficiencies in internal control over compliance, such that there is a reasonable possibility that material noncompliance with a type of compliance requirement of a federal program will not be prevented, or detected and corrected on a timely basis. We consider the deficiencies in internal control over compliance described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs as items 2014-005, 2014-006, 2014-007, and 2014-008 to be material weaknesses.

Muhlenberg County's responses to the internal control over compliance findings identified in our audit are described in the accompanying schedule of findings and questioned costs. Muhlenberg County's responses were not subjected to the auditing procedures applied in the audit of compliance and, accordingly, we express no opinion on the responses.

The purpose of this report on internal control over compliance is solely to describe the scope of our testing of internal control over compliance and the results of that testing based on the requirements of OMB Circular A-133. Accordingly, this report is not suitable for any other purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

Adam H. Edelen

Auditor of Public Accounts

April 30, 2015



MUHLENBERG COUNTY SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS

For The Year Ended June 30, 2014

MUHLENBERG COUNTY SCHEDULE OF FINDINGS AND QUESTIONED COSTS

Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014

Section I: Summary of Auditor's Results		
Type of auditor's report issued: Unmodified		
Internal control over financial reporting:		
Are any material weaknesses identified?	✓Yes	□ No
Are any significant deficiencies identified not considered to be material weaknesses?	□ Yes	☑None Reported
Is any noncompliance material to financial statements noted?	☑ Yes	□ No
Federal Awards		
Type of auditor's report issued on compliance for major pr Community Development Block Grant- State's Program and 16.' Justice Assistance Grant Program. Modified-11.300 Investm Economic Development Facilities	738 Edward Byrne	
Internal control over major programs:		
Are any material weaknesses identified?	☑ Yes	□ No
Are any significant deficiencies identified not considered to be material weaknesses?	□ Yes	✓ None Reported
Are any audit findings disclosed that are required to be reported in accordance with <u>U.S. Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133</u> , <i>Audits of State</i> , <i>Local Governments</i> , and <i>Non-Profit Organizations</i> , Section .510(a)?	☑ Yes	□No
Identification of major programs:		
CFDA Numbers and Name of Federal Program or Cluster		
14.228 Community Development Block Grant- State's Program		
11.300 Investments for Public Works and Economic Developme		
16.738 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Progr	am	
Enter the dollar threshold used to distinguish between Type A and Type B programs:	\$300,000	
Is the auditee qualified as a low-risk auditee?	☐ Yes	☑ No

Section II: Findings - Financial Statement Audit

Financial Statement Findings

2014-001 The Fiscal Court Does Not Have Adequate Controls Over Decentralized Receipts

The Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court does not issue receipts for all monies collected at the Agriculture Expo Center during events. The Agriculture Expo Center collects monies for parking, admissions, concessions, and other miscellaneous items. Additionally, the Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court does not issue receipts for monies collected at garbage drop-off locations or for the sale of garbage bags. The Fiscal Court operates drop-off stations that allow citizens of Muhlenberg County to bring their trash to these localized hubs for a nominal fee.

KRS 64.840(1) states "all county officials shall, upon the receipt of any fine, forfeiture, tax, or fee, prepare a receipt that meets the specifications of the state local finance officer..."

Implemented internal controls over decentralized receipts at the Expo center and for garbage collection are not adequate and do not meet the criteria required by KRS 64.840.

By not requiring a receipt for each payment, the opportunity for theft of funds or fraudulent recording is increased. The Fiscal Court cannot verify the total amount of money collected from the Agriculture Expo Center or document the total amount of funds collected for garbage collections, since they are not issuing receipts or keeping other documentation to support the collection of all funds received.

We recommend that the Fiscal Court require a receipt for each transaction of the Agriculture Expo Center and garbage collection in accordance with KRS 64.840 and to better determine the actual amount that is collected from each location.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response: This is a tough one. The court will discuss the best options to be in compliance and implement more adequate controls.

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response: The County Treasurer will confer with department heads regarding procedures to issue receipts and/or utilize receipt hardware.

2014-002 Telephone Commissions Contracts Should Be Approved By Fiscal Court And All Jail Disbursements Should Be Budgeted

In April 2011, the Jailer entered into an Inmate Telecommunication Service Agreement with Combined Public Communications (CPC), which allowed CPC to install the inmate telecommunication system that will process collect calls, prepay and direct pay calls, including local and long distance in the Muhlenberg County Detention Center. This agreement stated that the Fiscal Court was to receive monthly a commission of the gross revenue from all collect calls and direct pay calls, made by inmates within the facility. In addition, the agreement stated that CPC would provide the Muhlenberg County Detention Center a \$50,000 equipment allowance to be utilized however deemed appropriate. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 2014, the Jailer made equipment purchases totaling \$2,272 and sent the invoices to CPC. CPC paid the vendors directly.

KRS 441.225 states (1) Except for capital improvements, utilities and building insurance and except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, the jailer shall have authority to authorize expenditures from the jail budget. Such expenditures shall only be made in accordance with the line item jail budget duly adopted or amended by the fiscal court and the established county procurement code or purchase order procedure of the county. Payment for purchases for the jail shall be subject to fiscal court approval prior to payment. The fiscal

Section II: Findings - Financial Statement Audit

Financial Statement Findings

2014-002 Telephone Commissions Contracts Should Be Approved By Fiscal Court And All Jail Disbursements Should Be Budgeted (Continued)

court shall not withhold approval of payment for jail expenditures, which are within the jail budget and not unlawful.

The Fiscal Court did not approve the contract between the Jail and CPC. Additionally, there was no documentation the expenditures were ever presented to the Fiscal Court prior to payment.

Since the County Treasurer did not receive the equipment allowance, a total of \$2,272 was not included in the county's financial statements as budgeted receipts and budgeted disbursements for fiscal year end June 30, 2014.

We recommend that the Jailer have all future contracts approved by the Fiscal Court to reduce the risk of misappropriation of contract receipts or disbursements and to ensure that the Fiscal Court is aware of any signing bonuses included in the contract. Also, we recommend that all telephone commissions account activity be amended as necessary, into the county's budget. Invoices should be presented to the Fiscal Court for review prior to payment and approved payments should be recorded in the county's appropriation ledger as budgeted disbursements.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response: The Judge Executive and Treasurer will discuss with the Jailer to ensure compliance.

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response: The County Treasurer will confer with the Jailer regarding a change in procedure regarding the handling of the aforementioned procedures.

County Jailer Mark Curry's Response: Any future contract will be presented to fiscal court.

2014-003 Internal Controls Over Disbursements/Credit Cards Should Be Strengthened

During our testing of disbursements and credit cards, we noted the following deficiencies:

- Thirty-five disbursements/credit card transactions that did not have adequate supporting documentation (itemized invoices).
- One credit card statement did not have original invoices (six of the invoices were copies).
- Invoices were not properly marked paid.
- Credit cards were not always paid in full each month, resulting in finance charges/late fees of \$70.01.

Good internal controls dictate that adequate supporting documentation be maintained for all disbursements and credit card transactions. All vendor invoices and receipts should be maintained including any additional supporting documentation and agreed to the corresponding purchase order and reports.

These deficiencies over disbursements and credit card transactions occurred because the Fiscal Court's lack of internal controls and oversight.

Section II: Findings - Financial Statement Audit

Financial Statement Findings

2014-003 Internal Controls Over Disbursements/Credit Cards Should Be Strengthened (Continued)

Failing to maintain adequate documentation can result in paying invoices for goods or services that were not provided to the County. Invoices should be properly marked paid to prevent duplicate payment. Also, by not paying credit cards in full each month the Fiscal Court could be assessed penalties or finance charges.

We recommend that the County develop internal procedures to ensure that disbursements and credit card transactions are properly supported.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response: A memo will be sent to all those who use the credit cards and ask that all disbursements and credit card transactions are properly supported

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response: The County Treasurer and the County Judge Executive are discussing the possibility of decreasing the number and number of transactions whereby credit cards are utilized. Discussion will also be had regarding of issuing on centralized credit card to restrict the availability of the use of such credit card. The Finance Officer will scrutinize the remittance of transaction receipts to ensure proper documentation had been presented.

2014-004 The Fiscal Court Should Advertise For And Award Bids In Accordance With KRS 424.260

During disbursement testing, we noted one instance where a bid was not obtained as required by KRS 424.260 or items were not purchased from the state contract vendor. Instead of bidding or using the state contract vendor, the Fiscal Court purchased seven Chevrolet Caprices and one Chevrolet Silverado from a local dealership.

KRS 424.260 states "Except where a statute specifically fixes a larger sum as the minimum for a requirement of advertisement for bids, no city, county, or district, or board or commission of a city or county, or sheriff or county clerk, may make a contract, lease, or other agreement for materials, supplies except for perishable meat, fish and vegetables, equipment, or for contractual services other than professional, involving an expenditure of more than twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000), without first making newspaper advertisement for bids."

The Fiscal Court was under the assumption that they only had to pay the state contract price.

The Fiscal Court's failure to properly bid the purchase of the vehicles mentioned above caused the county to purchase from an ineligible vendor and be in violation of KRS 424.260.

We recommend the fiscal court comply with KRS 424.260 and properly advertise and award bids for all purchases over twenty thousand dollars or purchase items from state contract vendors.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response: Judge Executive will ensure proper bid procedures are followed. Also, will have a discussion with DLG concerning procedures.

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response: All future bid procedures will be properly reviewed for proper procedure.

Section II: Findings - Financial Statement Audit

Financial Statement Findings

2014-005 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Activities Allowed Or Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, And Cash Management And Received Duplicate Reimbursements For The Same Costs

See Comment Under Section III Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit

2014-006 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting And Submitted A Materially Misstated Financial Report To The United States Department Of Commerce-Economic Development Administration

See Comment Under Section III Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit

2014-007 The Fiscal Court Should Document Approval/Presentation Of All Expenditures Prior To Payment

See Comment Under Section III Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit

2014-008 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting For The Edward Byrne Grant And Had Questioned Costs Of \$12,832

See Comment Under Section III Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit

Section III: Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit

2014-005 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Activities Allowed Or Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, And Cash Management And Received Duplicate Reimbursements For The Same Costs

Federal Program: CFDA 11.300- Investments for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities

Award Number: 04-69-06556

Compliance Requirements: Activities Allowed or Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, and Cash

Management

Type of Finding: Material Weakness

Questioned Costs: \$47,207

Federal Program: CFDA 14.228- Community Development Block Grants/State's Program

Award Number: 10-004

Compliance Requirements: Activities Allowed or Unallowed and Allowable Costs/Cost Principles

Type of Finding: Material Weakness

Questioned Costs: None

Criteria: OMB A-87 Cost Principles For State, Local And Indian Tribal Governments states in the General Principles that to be allowable, costs "Not be included as a cost or used to meet cost sharing or matching requirements of any other Federal award in either the current or a prior period, except as specifically provided by Federal law or regulation." Additionally, the United States Department of Commerce-Economic Development Administration- Summary of EDA Construction Standards states "Neither cash nor the value of in-kind contributions may count towards satisfying a cost-sharing requirement of a grant agreement if it has been or will be counted towards satisfying a cost-sharing requirement of another federal grant agreement, a federal procurement contract, or any other award of federal funds."

Section III: Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit (Continued)

2014-005 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Activities Allowed Or Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, And Cash Management And Received Duplicate Reimbursements For The Same Costs (Continued)

Condition: Costs that were included on Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) draw requests and advanced by CDBG funds were submitted to the Economic Development Administration (EDA) for reimbursement as well. This was done in order to get advancements from the EDA grant rather than pay invoices and wait for reimbursement. This practice is in violation of OMB A-87.

Cause: Pennryile Area Development District (PADD) prepared and submitted reimbursement requests (approved by the County Judge Executive) to the EDA that had already been paid for from CDBG funds. PADD had been advised by the Atlanta Regional Office of the EDA that EDA did not consider CDBG funds to be federal funds and that the EDA treated CDBG funds as matching funds. The CDBG grant agreement states that the source of the CDBG funds is federal. Additionally, the CDBG grant stated that the Muhlenberg County Opportunity Center was to obtain the EDA grant.

Effect or Potential Effect: The Fiscal Court received reimbursements of \$326,285 from EDA. The Fiscal Court had unreimbursed expenses of \$279,078. As a result of submitting costs erroneously, Fiscal Court received \$47,207 in reimbursements when no costs were incurred.

Recommendation: The Fiscal Court should implement internal controls over Activities Allowed or Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, and Cash Management to ensure compliance with federal laws and requirements. Costs should be submitted only to one federal award unless specifically specified otherwise. DLG should be notified of EDA misunderstanding of the federal status of CDBG funds. Additionally, the Fiscal Court should not seek advancements of grant funds if the grant specifies reimbursements for allowable costs.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response and Corrective Action Planned: The Fiscal Court will implement controls with the grant agency as well as the agency who is managing the grant. Also internal controls with the treasurer will be implemented.

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response and Corrective Action Planned: The Grant had now been completed. We understand all future Grants cannot be matched with other Federal Grants. We did not know this procedure was a non-compliance. Our Area Development District was contracted to monitor this Grant. No time during the Grant were we made aware that we were not following procedures. The disbursements of this Grant were extensively monitored by the Area Development District before any funds were disbursed by the Fiscal Court. Corrective action plan for this specific Grant would be non-applicable.

Planned Implementation Date of Corrective Action: None.

Person Responsible for Corrective Action: All future Grants involving Federal Funds will be properly matched by procedures.

Section III: Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit (Continued)

2014-006 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting And Submitted A Materially Misstated Financial Report To The United States Department Of

Commerce-Economic Development Administration

Federal Program: CFDA 11.300- Investments for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities

Award Number: 04-69-06556

Compliance Requirements: Reporting Type of Finding: Material Weakness

Questioned Costs: \$57,477

Criteria: The United States Department of Commerce-Economic Development Administration- Summary of EDA Construction Standards requires "Semiannual financial reports. Any recipient whose Award has not been fully disbursed is required to submit Form SF-425 (Formerly 429), "Financial Status Report" to EDA semiannually to report on the status of unreimbursed obligations. This report will provide information on the amount of allowable project expenses that have been incurred, but not claimed for reimbursement by the recipient. The first report shall be as of March 30 of each year and shall be submitted to EDA no later than April 30 of each year, and the second report shall be of September 30 of each year and shall be submitted to EDA no later than October 30 of each year."

Condition: Auditor inspected a Federal Financial Report submitted to EDA dated May 2, 2014. This report was to list cumulative project expenditures as of March 30, 2014. The report shows zeros for all amounts except cash receipts and cash disbursements which were left blank. The County Judge Executive signed the report. Auditor noted a second report on file at PADD with the same date. That report was an edited copy of the original report on file at the county. The report submitted to EDA shows project expenditures of \$746,992. Actual expenditures as of March 31, 2014 (including those reimbursed with CDBG funds) were \$689,514. The report is materially misstated by \$57,477.

Cause: There were no internal controls in place to verify amounts submitted on federal "Financial Status Reports". Costs of the project were not correctly aggregated and therefore incorrect amounts of costs paid were submitted to the EDA.

Effect or Potential Effect: The report is materially misstated and expenditures are overstated by \$57,477.

Recommendation: The Fiscal Court should implement internal controls over federal financial reporting to ensure compliance with federal laws and requirements. Project costs should be correctly aggregated and submitted to the appropriate federal agency. Additionally, recipient shares of costs should not include amounts already reimbursed by another federal program.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response and Corrective Action Planned: controls will be implemented.

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response and Corrective Action Planned: The Area Development District was contracted to prepare progress financial information. The County Judge Executive had been ill and not always available to sign off on the proper financial reports.

Planned Implementation Date of Corrective Action: None.

Person Responsible for Corrective Action: All future reports will also be monitored by the County Treasurer to ensure proper financial reporting for Federal Grants.

Section III: Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit (Continued)

2014-007 The Fiscal Court Should Document Approval/Presentation Of All Expenditures Prior To Payment

Federal Program: CFDA 16.738 - Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program

Pass-Through Entity: State Department of Justice Award Number: 2013-JAG-Pennyrile-00956

Compliance Requirements: Activities Allowed or Unallowed and Allowable Costs/Cost

Principles

Type of Finding: Material Weakness/Material Noncompliance

Questioned Costs: None

Federal Program: CFDA 11.300- Investments for Public Works and Economic Development Facilities

Award Number: 04-69-06556

Compliance Requirements: Activities Allowed or Unallowed, Allowable Costs/Cost Principles, and Cash

Management

Type of Finding: Material Weakness

Questioned Costs: \$47,207

Federal Program: CFDA 14.228- Community Development Block Grants/State's Program

Award Number: 10-004

Compliance Requirements: Activities Allowed or Unallowed and Allowable Costs/Cost Principles

Type of Finding: Material Weakness

Questioned Costs: None

Criteria: KRS 68.275 requires "The county judge/executive shall present all claims to the fiscal court for review prior to payment and the court, for good cause shown, may order that a claim not be paid". In addition to KRS 68.275, OMB A-87 Cost Principles for State, Local, and Indian Tribal Governments, Section C, Basic Guidelines, Section 1, "Factor affecting allowability of costs. To be allowable under Federal awards, costs must meet the following general criteria: (c) Be authorized or not prohibited under State or local laws or regulations. (e) Be consistent with policies, regulations, and procedures that apply uniformly to both Federal awards and other activities of the governmental unit." OMB Circular A-87 establishes principles and standards for determining allowable direct and indirect costs for Federal awards.

Condition: Federal expenditures totaling \$230,165 were not presented to, or approved by Fiscal Court. This amount consists of two JAG expenditures totaling \$31,250 and six CDBG/EDA expenditures totaling \$198,915. Additionally, there were 62 non-federal operating expenditures totaling \$333,162 not properly presented or approved.

Cause: The internal control of Fiscal Court approval of expenditures was not being documented properly. Nor was there adequate documentation that expenditures had been presented to Fiscal Court by the County Judge Executive.

Effect or Potential Effect: Failure to present claims could lead to inappropriate payments and does not allow Fiscal Court opportunity to evaluate the claims. Additionally, failure to present federal disbursements could result in unallowable costs.

Recommendation: We recommend the Fiscal Court require all claims be presented in open court and be approved prior to payment.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response and Corrective Action Planned: All claims will be presented in open court prior to payment.

Section III: Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit (Continued)

2014-007 The Fiscal Court Should Document Approval/Presentation Of All Expenditures Prior To Payment (Continued)

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response and Corrective Action Planned: All bills paid by the Fiscal Court are available for inspection by all court staff before each court meeting. There were instances when listing of these bills were not properly placed in the court minutes. Most of these instances were before the exit conference from the prior audit and were corrected well before the audit of this year. Now, all bills will appear on a computer printout and enclosed in a folder for each court meeting to ensure they become part of the court's minutes. Again all the bills are available for review at each court meeting. This procedure has been totally corrected as of this date. Bill paying for all accounts had been assigned to one location, instead of two, and one listing is prepared to include bills of all funds. Most of the bills in question were a one line item of the budget, closely monitored by construction managers or in the case of the JAG Grant money, by a separate Board.

Planned Implementation Date of Corrective Action: None.

Person Responsible for Corrective Action: None.

2014-008 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting For The Edward Byrne Grant And Had Questioned Costs Of \$12,832

Federal Program: CFDA 16.738 - Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program

Pass-Through Entity: State Department of Justice Award Number: 2013-JAG-Pennyrile-00956

Compliance Requirements: Matching, Level of Effort and Earmarking and Reporting Principles

Type of Finding: Material Weakness/Material Noncompliance

Questioned Costs: \$12,832

Criteria: Office of Justice Programs – Financial Guide – Training Guide referenced in the grant agreement states "In order to monitor the status of funds awarded to a recipient, OJP and OVW require the submission of quarterly financial reports. Recipients are required to submit a Standard Form 425 (SF-425) in the Financial Status Reports (FSR) module in GMS for each grant or cooperative agreement received. The recipient must report summary information on expenditures, unliquidated obligations, recipient share (match), program income, and indirect expenses for each quarter of the project period."

Condition: The Pennyrile Narcotics Task Force did not write checks for the matching requirement of \$11,250 (\$3,750 per agency) to be paid to the three agencies with whom they have contractual agreements. These three agencies considered the matching of \$11,250 as a contribution made back to the Pennyrile Narcotics Task Force. Also, the 3rd quarter federal financial report included \$1,582 of expenditures; which were for the previous quarter and had already been reimbursed. This amount was picked up in error when the quarterly financial report was prepared.

Cause: There were no internal controls in place to verify amounts submitted on federal financial reports.

Section III: Findings And Questioned Costs - Major Federal Awards Program Audit (Continued)

2014-008 The Fiscal Court Failed To Implement Adequate Internal Controls Over Federal Financial Reporting For The Edward Byrne Grant And Had Questioned Costs Of \$12,832 (Continued)

Effect or Potential Effect: The federal financial report is materially misstated and expenditures are overstated by \$12,832.

Recommendation: The Fiscal Court should implement internal controls over federal financial reporting to ensure compliance with federal laws and requirements. There should be expenditures for all items reported on federal financial reports. Additionally, matching costs for contractual services to agencies should not be netted against contributions from those agencies.

County Judge/Executive Rick Newman's Response and Corrective Action Planned: The Fiscal Court will implement the adequate internal controls over federal financial reporting.

County Treasurer Charles R. Lewis' Response and Corrective Action Planned: The procedure will be monitored on all future Grants and this non-compliance will not occur. The Grant manager has been made aware of this non-compliance and will be prohibited from handling the transactions in this manner. The County Treasurer will also monitor all future transactions.

Planned Implementation Date of Corrective Action: None.

Person Responsible for Corrective Action: None.

Section IV: Summary Schedule of Prior Audit Findings (FEDERAL FINDINGS ONLY)

2013-003 The Fiscal Court Should Approve All Disbursements Prior To Payment

Federal Program: CFDA 16.738 - Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program Pass-Through

Entity: State Department of Justice

Award Number: 2012-JAG-Pennyrile-00925

Compliance Requirements: Activities Allowed or Unallowed and Allowable Costs/Cost Principles

Type of Finding: Material Weakness/Noncompliance

Amount of Questioned Costs: \$0

Comment repeated in current year as 2014-003.

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE - LOCAL GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

MUHLENBERG COUNTY FISCAL COURT

For The Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014

CERTIFICATION OF COMPLIANCE

For The Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014

The Muhlenberg County Fiscal Court hereby certifies that assistance received from the Local Government Economic Assistance and Development Programs were expended for the purpose intended as dictated by the applicable Kentucky Revised Statutes.

County Judge/Executive

County Treasurer